Remarks/Arguments

35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 1-16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,247,169 to Okada et al. in view of U.S. Patent 4,523,230 to Carlson et al., further in view of U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0142099 to Deering et al.

Cited U.S. Patent 5,247,169 to Okada et al. relates to an inspection apparatus in which image light reflected from the surface of an object to be inspected is split into two parts. Each image part is passed through an optical filter and split according to its wavelength. An image pickup simultaneously picks up both image parts and converts them to electrical signals. Nowhere does Okada et al. show or suggest:

> "a decomposer for dividing an input video signal into a plurality of signals having at least a high brightness signal and a low brightness signal",

as specifically recited in Claim 1 as amended. Rather, Okada et al. divide the optical image from the object being inspected into two parts. Each of the divided optical parts is passed through an optical filter which adjusts the quantity of transmitted light to a reference level. The adjusted light is then converted to an electrical signal by line image sensors 6 and 7. Nowhere does Okada et al. divide "an input video signal", as specifically recited in Claim 1 as amended.

Nowhere does Okada et al. teach or suggest anything relating to pixels nor to:

"reducing adjacent pixel interdependence in a liquid crystal display",

as specifically recited in Claim 1. Rather, Okada et al. relates merely to an inspection apparatus. Column 7, lines 5-16, and Column 3, lines 4-13, which have been pointed out by the Examiner, have nothing to do with "adjacent pixel interdependence in a liquid crystal display" as specifically recited in Claim 1 as amended.

U.S. Patent 4,523,230 to Carlson et al. relates to a video image processing system which reduces spurious harmonic components introduced by noise coring. If the teachings of Carlson et al. were to be combined with the teachings of Okada et al., the video signal generated by sensors 6 and 7 of Okada et al. would be cored in accordance with the teachings of Carlson et al. Even if such teachings were to be combined, nowhere would there be any teaching or suggestion of:

"a decomposer for dividing an input video signal into a plurality of signals having at least a high brightness signal and a low brightness signal",

as specifically recited in Claim 1 as amended.

Cited U.S. Published Application 2003/0142099 to Deering et al. relates to a graphics system which is switchable between sampled buffer contexts to improve the quality of a graphics display. If the teachings of Deering et al. were to be combined with the teachings of Okada et al. and Carlson et al., the video signals of Okada et al. would be cored according to Carlson et al., and processed according to Deering et al., before being displayed. Nowhere would the combination teach or suggest:

"a decomposer for dividing an input video signal into a plurality of signals having at least a high brightness signal and a low brightness signal",

as specifically recited in Claim 1 as amended. It is therefore clear that even if the teachings of Okada et al., Carlson et al., and Deering et al. were to be combined, the patentability of Claim 1 would not be affected.

Claims 2-8 are dependent from Claim 1 and add further advantageous features. The Applicant submits that these subclaims are patentable as their parent Claim 1.

Claim 9 specifically recites the step of:

"dividing an input video signal into at least a high brightness signal and a low brightness signal".

Nowhere do any of the three references, which have been relied upon by the Examiner, show or suggest this step of the method. It is therefore clear that the patentability of Claim 9, similar to Claim 1, is not affected by the three references that have been relied upon by the Examiner.

Claims 10-12 are dependent from Claim 9 and add further advantageous features. The Applicant submits that these subclaims are patentable as their parent Claim 9.

Claim 13 specifically recites:

"a decomposer comprising an input for receiving a video signal comprising respective samples of video brightness values, at least a high brightness providing consecutive high brightness value samples and a low brightness output providing consecutive low brightness value samples".

Nowhere do the three references relied upon by the Examiner, taken singly or in combination, show or suggest this structure, as explained above. The Applicant therefore submits that the patentability of Claim 13 is not affected by the three references which have been relied upon by the Examiner.

Claim 14 is dependent from Claim 1 and adds further advantageous features. The Applicant submits that Claim 14 is patentable as its parent Claim 1.

Claim 15 specifically recites:

"providing a video signal comprising respective samples of pixel brightness values, decomposing said video signal to provide a first video signal portion comprising consecutive high brightness value samples and a second video signal portion comprising consecutive low brightness value samples".

Nowhere do any of the cited references which have been relied upon by the Examiner show or suggest this structure, as discussed above. The Applicant therefore submits that the patentability of Claim 15 is not affected by the three references which have been relied upon by the Examiner.

Claim 16 is dependent from Claim 15 and sets forth further advantageous features. The Applicant submits that Claim 16 is patentable as its parent Claim 15.

The Applicant therefore submits that this application is now in condition for allowance. A notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
DONALD HENRY WILLIS

By: Daniel E. Sragow, Attorney
Reg. No. 22,856
Phone (609) 734-6832

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing LLC
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5312

April 27, 2007